Remarks

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application.

Per the Office Action of December 28, 2005:

Claims 31 and 32 stand allowed. Note that in this regard page 2 of the Office Action appears incorrect as compared to page 11 thereof.

Claims 9-14, 17, 22, and 24-27 were indicated to contain allowable subject matter but they are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 15-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3-8, 28-30, and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,815,501 issued to Gaddis et al. on September 29, 1998.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Gaddis et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,603,769 issued to Thubert et al. on August 5, 2003.

Claims 15, 16, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0110087 issued to Zelig et al. which was published on August 15, 2002.

Claims 20, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zelig et al. in view of Gaddis et al.

During the Examiner initiated series of telephone calls, the Examiner indicated that the previously filed amendment had been considered, and that the application was essentially in condition for allowance, but for the changes made hereinabove. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy and time spent with Applicant's undersigned representative. Note that claim 15 as amended is a rewritten version of what was claim 23, claim 33 as amended is a rewritten version of what was claim 34 as originally filed, and the changes to claims 28, 29, and 30 simply make explicit what was already implicit in the claims, both by way of language and support within the specification. Claims 24-27, which previously depended on claim 23, have now been amended to depend on claim 15, which, as noted, is a rewritten version of what was claim 23.

PAGE 12/14 * RCVD AT 5/31/2006 3:06:09 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/22 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7329490102 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-50

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewriting to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

PAGE 13/14 * RCVD AT 5/31/2006 3:06:09 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/22 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7329490102 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-50

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicant's attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this amendment to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this amendment, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate cost of such petition to the **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325.**

Respectfully,

Ilija Hadzic

By _____
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,658
732-949-1857

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 5/31/06

PAGE 14/14 * RCVD AT 5/31/2006 3:06:09 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/22 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7329490102 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-50

BEST AVAILABLE COPY